

bulletin





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XX, No. 519 • PUBLICATION 3532

June 12, 1949

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications. Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$5, foreign \$7.25
Single copy, 15 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (February 18, 1949).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Consultation Between the Economic and Social Council and Nongovernmental Organizations

COMPILED BY KATHLEEN BELL

Article 71 of the Charter states that—

The Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the Member of the United Nations concerned.

The Council established a Committee of the Council to draw up detailed proposals to implement this article. At the second session of the Council, June 1946, the basic arrangements under which the Council has been acting were adopted. In the 3 years that have followed, these arrangements have been modified and amplified. The following is an attempt to bring together under one heading all the resolutions and decisions of the Council and the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (Council Nco Committee) which establish the criteria, principles, rules, and privileges applicable to nongovernmental organizations entering into consultative relationship with the Economic and Social Council under article 71.

I. Definition of nongovernmental organizations

Any international organization which is not established by intergovernmental agreement shall be considered as a nongovernmental international organization.

II. Criteria of eligibility for applications¹

1. The organization shall be concerned with matters falling within the competence of the Economic and Social Council with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters.

2. The aims and purposes of the organization should be in conformity with the spirit, purposes, and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

3. Organizations proved to be discredited by past collaboration in Fascist activities shall not for the present be admitted.

4. The organization shall be of recognized standing and shall represent a substantial proportion of the organized persons within the particular interest field in which it operates. To meet this requirement, a group of organizations may form a joint committee or other body authorized to carry on consultation for the group as a whole.

5. The organization shall have an established headquarters, with an executive officer. It shall have a conference, convention, or other policy-making body.

6. The organization shall have authority to speak for its members through its authorized representatives. Evidence of this authority shall be presented, if requested.

7. The organization should be international in its structure, with members who exercise voting rights in relation to the policies or action of the international organization.

8. National organizations should normally present their views through their respective governments or through international nongovernmental organizations to which they belong. It would not, save in exceptional cases, be appropriate to include national organizations which are affiliated to an international nongovernmental organization covering the same subjects on an international basis. National organizations, however, may be included in the list after consultation with the member state concerned if they cover a field which is not covered by any international organization or have special experience upon which the Council wishes to draw.

¹ Resolutions of 2d Session, Journal 29, p. 482.

III. Principles governing the granting of status

1. It is important to note that a clear distinction is drawn in the Charter between participation without vote in the deliberations of the Council, and the arrangements for consultation. Under articles 69 and 70, participation is provided for only in the case of states not members of the Council, and of specialized intergovernmental agencies. Article 71 applying to nongovernmental organizations provided for suitable arrangements for consultation. It is considered that this distinction, deliberately made in the Charter, is fundamental and that the arrangements for consultation should not be such as to accord to nongovernmental organizations the same rights of participation accorded to states not members of the Council and to the specialized agencies brought into relationship with the United Nations.

2. It should also be recognized as a basic principle that the arrangements should not be such as to overburden the Council or transform it into a general forum for discussion instead of a body for coordination of policy and action, as is contemplated in the Charter.

3. Decisions on arrangements for consultation should be guided by the principle that consultative arrangements are to be made, on the one hand for the purpose of enabling the Council or one of its bodies to secure expert information or advice from organizations having special competence on the subjects for which consultative arrangements are made, and, on the other hand, to enable organizations which represent important elements of public opinion, to express their views. Therefore, the arrangements for consultation made with each organization should involve only the subjects for which that organization has a special competence or in which it has a special interest. In general these arrangements should be made for a definite period, reviewable at the end thereof.

4. Consultative arrangements should not be made with an international organization which is a member of a committee or group composed of international organizations with which consultative arrangements have been made except for different subjects than those for which consultative arrangements have been made with that committee or group.

¹ Resolutions of 6th Session, U.N. doc. E/777, p. 42.

² Resolutions of 7th Session, U.N. doc. E/1310, p. 22.

³ Resolutions of 3d Session, U.N. doc. E/245/rev. 1, p. 28.

5. In several of the fields covered by the Council there will exist specialized intergovernmental agencies brought into relationship with the Council, and participating in its deliberations as provided in article 70. There may be close connection and cooperation between these agencies and the nongovernmental organizations whose specific field of interest is the same as or similar to that of the specialized agency.

The Council should take this consideration into account.

6. Any reapplication for consultative status or requests for reclassification should be considered by the Council Ngo Committee, for recommendation to the Council, at earliest 18 months after the last occasion on which such applications or requests were considered by the Council, unless otherwise decided at the time of such consideration.²

7. International nongovernmental organizations which have legally constituted branches in Spain, the policies of which are determined and controlled by the Franco government, should be excluded from relationship under article 71 of the Charter of the United Nations.

8. Nongovernmental organizations which have legally constituted branches in Spain shall, however, be eligible for consultative relationship if their branches in Spain have the following characteristics:

(a) If these branches are not actively participating in the international nongovernmental organization in which they may hold membership, that is to say, if they are not represented on any of the policy-forming bodies of the international nongovernmental organizations concerned, do not vote therein, and make no financial contribution;

(b) If these branches are active but have a purely humanitarian character and if their policies are not determined and controlled by the Franco government.

9. Nongovernmental organizations should also be eligible for consultative relationship if they have only individual members in Spain who are not organized into a legally constituted branch.³

10. In general these arrangements should be made for a definite period, reviewable at the end thereof.⁴

11. Any new applications for consultative status received from organizations, reapplications, requests for reclassification or any new data involv-

ing substantial changes in applications already received will not be considered, if received later than 6 weeks before the opening of the Economic and Social Council.⁵

IV. Functions of the Council Ngo Committee

The Council shall establish a Standing Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations composed of the President and five members of the Council to be elected each year at the first regular session of the Council, (1) to recommend to the Council what action should be taken on applications for consultative status submitted by nongovernmental organizations, and (2) to consult with nongovernmental organizations in categories (a), (b), and (c).⁶

V. Consultation with the Economic and Social Council

i. Organizations in categories (a), (b), and (c)

1. Nongovernmental organizations in categories (a), (b), and (c) may designate authorized representatives to sit as observers at all public meetings of the Council and of its committees.

2. The Council may consult, through the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, with nongovernmental organizations in categories (a), (b), or (c) upon matters in which such organizations have special competence or knowledge, if the Council so decides or if the nongovernmental organization specifically requests such consultation. The representatives of the organizations shall be entitled to participate fully in any discussion of substance during such consultation.

3. The Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations shall report on its consultations to the Council in sufficient detail to permit the members of the Council to form their own judgment regarding the importance of the subject under consideration and any action to be taken thereon.⁷

4. The Secretariat is urged to be so organized as to render all appropriate assistance to nongovernmental organizations and offer to them all appropriate facilities. Such assistance might include the arrangement of interviews with individual members of the Council or its commissions, and the arrangement of informal discussions on matters of special interest to groups of organizations. The Secretariat would also aid organizations in obtaining documentation and securing special fa-

cilities, for instance, the use of the library, meeting place, etc.⁸

5. It was agreed that organizations wishing to be heard should be given fixed and reasonable dates early in the session and that noncompliance would involve forfeiture of their right to be heard during that session.⁹

6. The Secretary-General has been requested to prepare for distribution to the members of the Council a list by categories (a), (b), and (c) of communications from nongovernmental organizations received since the end of a session of the Council and up to the adoption of the agenda of the next session, indicating their titles and document numbers and which of them are specifically addressed to items on the agenda as adopted by the Council. It is understood that the establishment of such lists will not derogate from the right of nongovernmental organizations in category (a) to request a hearing before the Council on any substantive item on the agenda of the Council.¹⁰

ii. Organizations in category (a)

1. The provisional agenda of each regular session of the Council shall include all items proposed by:

(3) Members of the United Nations, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations in category (a), if submitted with basic documents in sufficient time to reach the Secretary-General not less than seven weeks before the first meeting of each session. Any item submitted to the Secretary-General for inclusion upon the provisional agenda less than seven weeks before the date of the first meeting of the session shall be accompanied by a statement of the urgency of the item and of the reasons which precluded its submission within the period of time specified, as well as by the basic documents. Such items shall, together with the above-mentioned statement and any comments the Secretary-General sees fit to offer, be placed before the Agenda Committee.¹¹

⁵ U.N. doc. E/940/Add. 4.

⁶ Rule 78, Rules of Procedure, Resolutions of 8th Session, U.N. doc. E/1310, p. 38.

⁷ *Ibid.* Rule 79.

⁸ Resolutions of 2d Session, Journal 29, p. 486.

⁹ U.N. doc. E/940/Add. 1, p. 11.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹¹ Rule 10, Rules of Procedure, Resolutions of 8th Session, U.N. doc. E/1310.

2. The provisional agenda for each session shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General in consultation with the President and shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to the members of the United Nations, to the President of the Security Council, to the President of the Trusteeship Council, to the specialized agencies and to the nongovernmental organizations in category (a), (1) in the case of regular sessions 6 weeks before the opening of the session, and (2) in the case of special sessions, at the same time as the notice convening the Council.¹²

3. Nongovernmental organizations in category (a) may circulate to the Council through the Secretary-General written statements and suggestions on matters within their competence.¹³

4. Whenever the Council discusses the substance of an item proposed by a nongovernmental organization in category (a), as provided for in rule 10, and placed on the agenda of the Council, such an organization shall be entitled to present orally to the Council, or, if the item is referred in the first instance to a committee of the whole of the Council, to the committee, an introductory statement of an expository nature. In the course of the discussion, the organization, if invited by the President of the Council or the chairman of the committee, with the consent of the relevant body, may make one further statement either before the Council or before the committee.¹³

5. A nongovernmental organization in category (a) desiring to speak either before the Council or a committee of the whole on an item which it has not proposed, shall make such a request in writing to the chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations not later than 48 hours after the adoption of the agenda by the Council. The Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations shall as soon as possible thereafter hear the views of the nongovernmental organization on its request, and upon the recommendation of this Committee, the Council as a whole, or the appropriate committee, may arrange to hear one statement by a representative of the organization.¹⁵

¹² Rule 11, Rules of Procedure, Resolutions of 8th Session, U.N. doc. E/1310.

¹³ *Ibid.* Rule 80.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* Rule 81.

¹⁵ Social, Human Rights, Status of Women, Economic and Employment, Fiscal, Statistical, Population, and Transport and Communications.

iii. Organizations in categories (b) and (c)

1. Organizations in categories (b) and (c) may submit to the Secretariat written statements and suggestions on matters within their competence. The Secretariat will prepare and distribute a list of all such communications, briefly indicating the substance of each. Upon the request of any member of the Council, a communication will be reproduced in full and distributed. Any lengthy communication will be distributed by the Secretariat only if sufficient copies are furnished by the organization concerned.¹⁴

2. Organizations in categories (b) and (c) shall not be heard by the Council or a committee of the whole, but upon their request in writing to the chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations within 48 hours of the adoption by the Council of the final agenda, they shall be given opportunity to express their views on any item on the agenda within their competence before the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations which will report to the Council on such hearings in accordance with rule 79.¹⁴

VI. Consultation with the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council.¹⁵

The Rules of Procedure of the Council were revised during the 8th session of the Council. The Rules of Procedure of the Functional Commission will be revised during the 10th Session to bring them into line with the new rules of the Council. Until that time the following rules are in force:

i. Organizations in category (a), (b), and (c)

1. The provisional agenda for each session shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General in consultation with the chairman whenever possible and shall be communicated to the members of the Commission, and in the case of the Narcotics Commission, to the President of the Permanent Central Opium Board and to the chairman of the Supervisory Body, to all other members of the United Nations, to the specialized agencies, to the nongovernmental organizations in category (a), and to the appropriate nongovernmental organizations in categories (b) and (c), together with the notice convening the Commission.

2. As soon as possible the text of all reports, resolutions, recommendations, and other formal decisions adopted by the Commission and its sub-

sidiary bodies, shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to the members of the Commission, and as soon as possible after the end of the session to all members of the United Nations and to the specialized agencies, to the nongovernmental organizations in category (a), and to the appropriate nongovernmental organizations in categories (b) and (c) ¹⁶

ii. Organizations in category (a)

1. To insure effective consultation with commissions on matters in which organizations have special competence or knowledge, it is recommended that consultation with organizations in category (a) should normally be with the commission itself.¹⁷

2. The provisional agenda (of functional commissions) shall include items:

a. proposed by the commission at a previous session;

b. proposed by any member of the United Nations;

c. proposed by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council, a specialized agency, or a nongovernmental organization in category (a).¹⁸

iii. Organizations in categories (b) and (c)

1. Those organizations included in categories (b) and (c) would normally be linked for consultation purposes with the particular commission or commissions concerned with these fields of interest. The commission or commissions might consult with these organizations either directly or through a committee or committees established for the purpose. In all cases, such consultations may be arranged on the invitation of the Commission or on the request of the organization.¹⁹

VII. Consultation with the regional commissions of the Economic and Social Council

i. Economic Commission for Europe²⁰ and Economic Commission for Latin America²¹

1. Nongovernmental organizations in categories (a), (b), and (c) may designate authorized representatives to sit as observers at public meetings of the Commission. Nongovernmental organizations in category (a) may circulate to the members of the Commission written statements and suggestions on matters within their competence. Nongovernmental organizations in categories (b)

and (c) may submit such statements and suggestions to the Executive Secretary. The Executive Secretary will prepare and distribute at each session of the Commission a list of such communications received, briefly indicating the substance of each of them. On the request of any member of the Commission the Executive Secretary will reproduce in full and distribute any such communication.

2. The Commission at its discretion may consult with nongovernmental organizations in categories (a), (b), and (c) on matters in which the Commission regards these organizations as having special competence or knowledge. Such consultations may be arranged on the invitation of the Commission or on the request of the organization. In the case of nongovernmental organizations in category (a) consultations should normally be held with the Commission itself. In the case of nongovernmental organizations in categories (b) and (c) consultations might be effected either directly or through *ad hoc* committees.

ii. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE)

1. Nongovernmental organizations in categories (a), (b), and (c) may designate authorized representatives to sit as observers at public meetings of the Commission. The Executive Secretary will circulate to the members and associate members of the Commission written statements and suggestions submitted by category (a) organizations on matters within their competence. Nongovernmental organizations in categories (b) and (c) may submit such statements and suggestions to the Executive Secretary, who will prepare and distribute at each session of the Commission a list of such communications briefly indicating the substance of each. Upon the request of any member or associate member of the Commission, the Executive Secretary will distribute the full text of any such communication.

¹⁶ Rules 5 and 44, Rules of Procedure of the Functional Commissions, Resolutions of 6th Session, U.N. doc. E/777, p. 43.

¹⁷ Resolutions of 2d Session, Journal 29, p. 485.

¹⁸ Rule 8, Rules of Procedure of Functional Commissions, U.N. doc. E/565, p. 16.

¹⁹ Resolutions of 2d Session, Journal 29, pp. 485-486.

²⁰ Rules 47 and 48, Rules of Procedure of ECE, U.N. doc. E/CN.10/2/Rev. 4, p. 9.

²¹ Rules 49 and 50, U.N. doc. E/840, pp. 26-27.

2. The Commission may consult with nongovernmental organizations in categories (a), (b), and (c) on matters in which the Commission regards these organizations as having special competence or knowledge. Such consultations may be arranged either on the invitation of the Commission or upon the request of the organization. In the case of nongovernmental organizations in category (a), consultations should normally be held with the Commission itself. The Commission may consult with organizations in categories (b) and (c) either directly or through a committee or committees established for that purpose.²²

VIII. List of nongovernmental organizations granted consultative status by the Economic and Social Council

i. Organizations in category (a)

1. World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU)
2. International Cooperative Alliance (ICA)
3. American Federation of Labor (AFL)
4. International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)
5. International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP)
6. International Federation of Christian Trade Unions (ICTU)
7. Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU)
8. International Organization of Employers (IOE)
9. World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA)

ii. Organizations in category (b)

1. Agudas Israel World Organization
2. All-India Women's Conference
3. Associated Country Women of the World (ACWW)
4. Boy Scouts' International Bureau
5. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
6. Catholic International Union for Social Service
7. Commission of the Churches on International Affairs (CCIA)
8. Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations (CCJO)
9. Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations for Consultation with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
10. Econometric Society, The
11. Friends World Committee for Consultation
12. Howard League for Penal Reform
13. Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production
14. International Abolitionist Federation
15. International African Institute
16. International Alliance of Women—Equal Rights, Equal Responsibilities
17. International Association of Democratic Lawyers

18. International Association of Penal Law
19. International Automobile Federation (IAF)
20. International Touring Alliance (ITA)
21. International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children
22. International Bureau for the Unification of Penal Law
23. International Carriage and Van Union—R.I.C.
24. International Wagon Union
25. International Committee of Schools of Social Work
26. International Conference of Social Work
27. International Committee of the Red Cross
28. International Cooperative Women's Guild
29. International Council of Women
30. International Criminal Police Commission
31. International Federation for Housing and Town Planning
32. International Federation of Business and Professional Women
33. International Federation of Friends of Young Women
34. International Federation of University Women
35. International Fiscal Association (IFA)
36. International Institute of Administrative Sciences
37. International Institute of Public Finance
38. International Institute of Public Law
39. International Law Association, The (ILA)
40. International League for the Rights of Man, The
41. International Organization for Standardization (ISO)
42. International Organization of Journalists
43. International Road Transport Union (IRU)
44. International Social Service (ISS)
45. International Statistical Institute (ISI)
46. International Student Service (ISS)
47. International Transport Workers' Federation (ITWF)
48. International Union for Child Welfare
49. International Union of Architects
50. International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues
51. International Union of Family Organizations
52. International Union of Local Authorities
53. International Union of Official Travel Organizations
54. International Union of Producers and Distributors of Electric Power
55. Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations
56. National Association of Manufacturers
57. Pax Romana—International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs
58. Pax Romana—International Movement of Catholic Students
59. Salvation Army, The
60. Service Civil International
61. Women's International Democratic Federation
62. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

²² Rules 47 and 48, Rules of Procedure of ECAFE, U.N. doc. E/839, p. 68.

Summary of Important Decisions of the Second Part of the Third Session of the General Assembly

The second part of the Third Session of the General Assembly, which opened on April 5, ended on May 18.

The first part of the session, held in Paris from September 21 to December 12, 1948, had been unable to complete action on all its agenda items and referred 19 of these to this second part in New York. With additional items the number of questions before this New York session totaled 26, and they included such matters as the future of the former Italian colonies, the Spanish question, observance of human rights in Hungary and Bulgaria, the admission of Israel, freedom of information, the promotion of international cooperation in the political field, refugees and displaced persons.

In the course of the 150 plenary and committee meetings of this session came news of success in other spheres in which the United Nations has played an important role of mediation and conciliation: the Berlin agreement reached by United Nations delegates on United Nations ground; and the agreement in Indonesia between the Netherlands and Republican leaders meeting under United Nations auspices.

Among its important decisions of the second part of this session the Assembly has:

- admitted Israel as its 59th member [BULLETIN of May 29, 1949];

- rejected proposals which would have modified the Assembly's previous stand with regard to Spain [post, p. 749];

- recommended measures whereby the permanent members of the Security Council, by agreement, may limit the use of the "veto" [BULLETIN, Jan. 23, 1949];

- adopted proposals for inquiry and conciliation

in the settlement of disputes [BULLETIN of Jan. 23, 1949 and post, p. 746];

expressed its concern at the accusations made against Bulgaria and Hungary regarding the suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms and urgently drawn the attention of these governments to their obligations under the peace treaties [BULLETIN of May 15, 1949];

declared that any measures which prevent or coerce wives of citizens of other nationalities from leaving their country of origin with their husbands or in order to join them abroad are not in conformity with the Charter . . . and recommended the U.S.S.R. to withdraw any such measures which have been adopted [BULLETIN of May 15, 1949];

drafted and recommended for early adoption by member states and others invited to the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, a draft convention—the first of its kind—on the International Transmission of News and the Right of Correction [BULLETIN of May 29, 1949]; urged Governments to take prompt action to ratify the ILO Convention on Freedom of Association and the Right to Organize [BULLETIN of May 29, 1949];

asked the Economic and Social Council to study the problem of slavery [post, p. 748];

invited India, Pakistan, and the Union of South Africa to discuss at a round-table conference the question of the treatment of persons of Indian origin in South Africa [post, p. 748];

The question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies, lengthily discussed, was deferred for further consideration at the next, fourth, regular session [BULLETIN of June 5, 1949].

TEXTS OF RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Study of Methods for the Promotion of International Cooperation in the Political Field

The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on April 28, 1949, (A/846) included parts C and D, which were in addition to the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Political Committee printed in the BULLETIN of January 23, 1949, page 101. Minor changes made by the General Assembly are the following: Under A, the third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs read "whereas" rather than

"Noting"; Under B fourth paragraph, delete the last word, "and"; sixth paragraph delete the sixth word, "should".

C

Proposed amendments to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly

The General Assembly

Resolves that the proposed amendments to rules 31 and 58 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly submitted by the Interim Committee for

consideration by the General Assembly (A/605, Annex II: Proposed amendments to rules of procedure of the General Assembly submitted for consideration by the General Assembly) be recommended to the Interim Commission for further consideration in the broader context of the studies which it is to undertake concerning the procedures of the General Assembly relating to the pacific settlement of disputes.

D

Creation of a panel for inquiry and conciliation

The General Assembly,

MINDFUL of its responsibilities, under Articles 13 (paragraph 1 a) and 11 (paragraph 1) of the Charter, to promote international co-operation in the political field and to make recommendations with regard to the general principles of the maintenance of international peace and security,

DEEMING it desirable to facilitate in every practicable way the compliance by Member States with the obligation in Article 33 of the Charter first of all to seek a solution of their disputes by peaceful means of their own choice,

NOTING the desirability, as shown by the experience of organs of the United Nations, of having qualified persons readily available to assist those organs in the settlement of disputes and situations by serving on commissions of inquiry or of conciliation,

CONCLUDING that to make provision for a panel of persons having the highest qualifications in this field available to any States involved in controversies and to the General Assembly, the Security Council and their subsidiary organs, when exercising their respective functions in relation to disputes and situations, would promote the use and effectiveness of procedures of inquiry and conciliation,

1. *Invites* each Member State to designate from one to five persons who, by reason of their training, experience, character and standing, are deemed to be well fitted to serve as members of commissions of inquiry or of conciliation and who would be disposed to serve in that capacity;

2. *Directs* the Secretary-General to take charge of the administrative arrangements connected with the composition and use of the panel;

3. *Adopts* the annexed articles¹ relating to the composition and use of the Panel for Inquiry and Conciliation.

ARTICLES RELATING TO THE COMPOSITION AND USE OF THE PANEL FOR INQUIRY AND CONCILIATION

Article 1

The Panel for Inquiry and Conciliation shall consist of persons designated by Member States who, by reason of

¹The text of the articles is to be found in document A/833 and will be included in the printed volume of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly during its third session (part II). The BULLETIN here prints these articles.

their training, experience, character and standing, are deemed to be well fitted to serve as members of commissions of inquiry or of conciliation and who would be disposed to serve in that capacity. Each Member State may designate from one to five persons, who may be private persons or government officials. In designating any of its officials, a State shall agree to make every effort to make such person available if his services on a commission are requested. Two or more States may designate the same person. Members of the panel shall be designated for a term of five years and such designations shall be renewable. Members of commissions appointed under these articles shall not, in the performance of their duties, seek or receive instructions from any Government. Membership in the panel shall not, however, render a person ineligible for appointment, as representatives of his Government or otherwise, on commissions or other bodies not formed under these articles.

Article 2

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall have general responsibility for the administrative arrangements connected with the panel. Each Government shall notify him of each designation of a person for inclusion in the panel, including with each notification full pertinent biographical information. Each Government shall inform him when any member of the panel designated by it is no longer available due to death, incapacity or inability to serve.

The Secretary-General shall communicate the panel and any changes which may occur in it from time to time to the Member States, to the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Interim Committee. He shall, where necessary, invite Member States promptly to designate replacements to fill any vacancies on the panel which may occur.

Article 3

The panel shall be available at all times to the organs of the United Nations in case they wish to select from it members of commissions to perform tasks of inquiry or conciliation in connexion with disputes or situations in respect of which the organs are exercising their functions.

Article 4

The panel shall be available at all times to all States, whether or not Members of the United Nations, which are parties to any controversy, for the purpose of selecting from the panel members of commissions to perform tasks of inquiry or conciliation with a view to settlement of the controversy.

Article 5

The method of selecting members of a commission of inquiry or of conciliation from the panel shall be determined in each case by the organ appointing the commission or, in the case of commissions appointed by or at the request of States parties to a controversy, by agreement between the parties.

Whenever the parties to a controversy jointly request the Secretary-General, the President of the General Assembly or the Chairman of the Interim Committee to appoint under these articles a member or members of a commission to perform tasks of inquiry or conciliation in respect of the controversy, or whenever such request is otherwise made pursuant to the provisions of a treaty or agreement registered with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the officer so requested shall appoint from the panel the number of commissioners required.

Article 6

In connexion with the constituting of any commission under these articles, the Secretary-General shall give the United Nations organ concerned or the parties to the

controversy every assistance, by the performance of such tasks as ascertaining the availability of individuals selected from the panel, and making arrangements for the time and place of meeting of the persons so selected.

Article 7

Members of commissions constituted pursuant to these articles by United Nations organs shall have the privileges and immunities specified in the General Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations. Members of commissions constituted by States under these articles should, so far as possible, receive the same privileges and immunities.

Article 8

Members of commissions constituted under these articles shall receive appropriate compensation for the period of their service. In the case of commissions constituted under article 4, such compensation shall be provided by the parties to the controversy, each party providing an equal share.

Article 9

Subject to any determinations that may be made by the United Nations organ concerned or by the parties to a controversy in constituting commissions under articles 3 and 4, respectively, commissions constituted under these articles may meet at the seat of the United Nations or at such other places as they may determine to be necessary for the effective performance of their functions.

Article 10

The Secretary-General shall assign to each commission constituted by a United Nations organ under these articles, staff adequate to enable it to perform its duties and shall, as necessary, seek expert assistance from specialized agencies brought into relationship with the United Nations. He shall enter into suitable arrangements with the proper authorities of States in order to assure the commission, so far as it may find it necessary to exercise its functions within their territories, full freedom of movement and all facilities necessary for the performance of its functions. The Secretary-General shall, at the request of any commission appointed by parties to a controversy pursuant to article 4, render this assistance to the commission to the extent possible.

Upon completion of its proceedings each commission appointed by a United Nations organ shall render such reports as may be determined by the appointing organ. Each commission appointed by or at the request of parties to a controversy pursuant to article 4, shall file a report with the Secretary-General. If a settlement of the controversy is reached, such report will normally merely state the terms of settlement.

United Nations Guard

U.N. doc. A/848
Adopted Apr. 29, 1949

The General Assembly,

HAVING CONSIDERED the proposal made by the Secretary-General for the creation of a United Nations Guard for the purposes set forth in his report of 28 September 1948,²

REALIZING the need for a thorough study of the matter before concrete action can be taken thereon,

Resolves to establish a Special Committee of specially qualified representatives of Australia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Haiti, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom and United States of America.

The Special Committee shall study the proposal for the establishment of a United Nations Guard in all its relevant aspects, including the technical, budgetary and legal problems involved, and such other proposals as may be made by Member States and by the Secretary-General with regard to other similar means of increasing the effectiveness of the services provided to the United Nations missions by the Secretary-General and shall prepare a report embodying its observations and recommendations for consideration during the fourth regular session of the General Assembly.

Study of the Social Problems of the Aboriginal Populations and Other Underdeveloped Social Groups of the American Continent

U.N. doc. A/869
Adopted May 11, 1949

WHEREAS the Charter sets forth as one of the objectives of the United Nations the promotion of social progress and higher standards of living throughout the world,

WHEREAS there exist on the American Continent a large aboriginal population and other underdeveloped social groups which face peculiar social problems that it is necessary to study in the field of international co-operation,

WHEREAS several American nations are directly and vitally interested in that problem,

WHEREAS the material and cultural development of those populations would result in a more profitable utilization of the natural resources of America to the advantage of the world,

The General Assembly

1. *Recommends* that, in accordance with Articles 13 and 62 of the Charter, the Economic and Social Council, with the assistance of the specialized agencies concerned, and in collaboration with the *Instituto Indigenista Interamericano*, study the situation of the aboriginal populations and of the above-mentioned under-developed social groups of the States of the American Continent requesting such help;

2. *Invites* the Secretary-General to co-operate in such studies as are deemed necessary, in consultation with the interested Member States and taking into account the studies and conclusions of the *Instituto Indigenista Interamericano*, in compliance with the terms of this resolution.

Refugees and Displaced Persons

U.N. doc. A/871
Adopted May 16, 1949

1. The General Assembly, at its 142nd plenary meeting on 24 September 1948, referred the following item on its agenda to the Third Committee for consideration and report:

Refugees and displaced persons:

(a) Problem of refugees and displaced persons: item proposed by Poland (A/614);

² U.N. doc. A/656.

(b) Repatriation, resettlement and immigration of refugees and displaced persons: Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/636).

2. The Third Committee devoted its 228th and 229th meetings on 12 May 1949 to the consideration of this item, which it had not had time to discuss during the first part of the third session of the Assembly.

3. The Committee first considered a draft resolution submitted by Poland (A/C.3/513), which was rejected by 19 votes to 6, with 11 abstentions.

4. It then considered the Report of the Economic and Social Council on the repatriation, resettlement and immigration of refugees and displaced persons. A draft resolution on this question submitted by Brazil, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (A/C.3/403) was withdrawn in favour of a shorter text (A/C.3/518), which was adopted by 27 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

5. Accordingly, the Third Committee recommends the General Assembly to adopt the following resolution:

REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

The General Assembly

TAKES NOTE of the report of the Secretary-General, drawn up in consultation with the International Refugee Organization (E/816 and A/C.3/375), on the repatriation, resettlement and immigration of refugees and displaced persons.

Discriminations Practised by Certain States Against Immigrating Labor, and in Particular, Against Labor Recruited From the Ranks of Refugees

U.N. doc. A/872
Adopted May 16, 1949

1. The delegation of Poland proposed that the question of discriminations practised by certain States against immigrating labour (A/614) be placed on the agenda of the third regular session of the General Assembly. The General Assembly at its 142nd plenary meeting of 24 September 1948 referred the item to the Third Committee for consideration and report. The Committee was not, however, able to take up consideration of the item during the first part of the third session.

2. The representative of Poland informed the Third Committee at its 229th meeting that his delegation wished to postpone examination of the item to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly.

3. Accordingly, the Third Committee unanimously decided at that meeting to recommend the General Assembly to adopt the following resolution:

DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST IMMIGRATING LABOUR

The General Assembly,

CONSIDERING the statement made by the Polish

delegation to the effect that it wishes to postpone examination of the item to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly.

Withdraws from the agenda of its third session the item entitled: "Discriminations practised by certain States against immigrating labour, and in particular against labour recruited from the ranks of refugees".

Treatment of People of Indian Origin in the Union of South Africa

U.N. doc. A/880
Adopted May 14, 1949

The General Assembly,

TAKING NOTE of the application made by the Government of India regarding the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa as well as of considerations put forward by the Government of the Union, and having examined the matter,

Invites the Governments of India, Pakistan and the Union of South Africa to enter into discussion at a round-table conference, taking into consideration the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights.

Slavery

U.N. doc. A/877
Adopted May 16, 1949

The General Assembly

Requests the Economic and Social Council to study the problem of slavery at its next session.

Trade Union Rights

U.N. doc. A/878
Adopted May 13, 1949

The General Assembly,

RECALLING that at its second regular session it endorsed the principles proclaimed by the International Labour Conference at its thirtieth session in respect of trade union rights and approved the request made by the Economic and Social Council at its fifth session that the International Labour Organisation should continue its efforts in order that one or several international conventions on the subject may be adopted, and

NOTING that the International Labour Conference at San Francisco in the course of its thirty-first session adopted, on 9 July 1948, a Convention on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize, and that this Convention has now been communicated to Governments for ratification,

Expresses the earnest hope that Governments will take prompt action for the early ratification of the Convention of Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize adopted by the International Labour Conference at San Francisco.

World Social and Cultural Situation

U.N. doc. A/879
Adopted May 13, 1949

The General Assembly,
CONSIDERING that the Economic and Social Council has been entrusted by the Charter with the responsibility of helping to solve international problems in the economic, social, humanitarian and cultural fields,

CONSIDERING that solutions to these problems can best be achieved through exhaustive studies in the corresponding fields,

CONSIDERING that the Council has already initiated, in the economic field, a series of general studies on the world economic situation which has been of the greatest practical use to it in carrying out its work,

Invites the Economic and Social Council to consider, on the basis of a report by its Social Commission and after consultation with the specialized

agencies and the non-governmental organizations concerned, the possibility of drafting a general report on the world social and cultural situation.

The Spanish Question

NOTE: No resolution was adopted by the Assembly.

The resolution submitted in the report of the First Committee which had originally been jointly submitted in Committee by Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia and Peru, failed to secure the requisite two-thirds majority.¹ The roll-call vote was 26 in favor, 15 against, with 16 abstentions.

A Polish proposal (Document A/860) was rejected in a vote by show of hands, 6 in favor, 40 against, with 7 abstentions. The individual paragraphs of the Polish proposal had previously been rejected in a series of nine votes, seven of which were by roll call. (See Press Release GA/492.)

Current United Nations Documents: A Selected Bibliography²

Economic and Social Council

Official Records, Third Year

Sixth Session. Supplement No. 5.

Report of the second session of the Commission on the Status of Women (5-19 January 1948). E/615, January 26, 1948. 23 pp. Printed. 25¢.

Preliminary List of Questions for the Provisional Agenda of the Ninth Session of the Council. E/1278, Mar. 14, 1949. 3 pp. mimeo.

Assistance Rendered by the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies for the Promotion of the Economic Development of Under-Developed Countries. E/CN.1/Sub. 3/24, Mar. 4, 1949. 88 pp. mimeo.

Living Conditions in Under-Developed Countries and Territories. The Study of Standards of Living in Less Developed Areas of Africa, Asia, Middle and South America, and the Pacific. E/CN.5/108, Mar. 11, 1949. 14 pp. mimeo.

Technical Assistance for Social Development. Report on International Exchange of Social Welfare Personnel. E/CN.5/105, Mar. 11, 1949. 130 pp. mimeo.

— International Social Welfare Advisory Services. E/CN.5/108, Mar. 17, 1949. 94 pp. mimeo.

Report Based on Replies to Part I, Section G (Nationality) of the Questionnaire on the Legal Status and Treatment of Women. E/CN.6/82, Feb. 28, 1949. 123 pp. mimeo.

General Assembly

Official Records of the Third Session of the General Assembly, Part I.

— Resolutions, 21 September-12 December 1948. A/810, December 1948. viii, 181 pp. Printed. \$2.00.

— General Committee. Summary Records of Meetings 22 September-11 December 1948. v, 81 pp. Printed. 80¢.

— Joint Second and Third Committee. Summary Records of Meetings 5 October-16 November 1948. xii, 147 pp. Printed. \$1.50.

— Economic and Financial Questions. Second Committee. Summary Records of Meetings 21 September-26 November 1948. xiv, 369 pp. Printed. \$3.70.

— Trusteeship. Fourth Committee. Summary Records of Meetings 21 September-22 November 1948. xii, 378 pp. Printed. \$4.00.

Official Records, second session *Ad Hoc* Committee on Headquarters. Summary Records of Meetings. 24 September to 13 November 1947. vii, 30 pp. printed. 40¢.

¹ For text of the resolution, see BULLETIN of May 22, 1949, p. 653.

² Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

[June 4-10]

International Law Commission

The International Law Commission concluded its first session on June 9 with the formal adoption of its report to the General Assembly, which included the draft declaration on the rights of states. The Commission completed action on its final agenda item "ways and means of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available" by deciding that one of its members would draw up a working paper on the subject for consideration at the next session.

The Commission appointed six members as special rapporteurs to prepare working papers for the next session on topics discussed during this session. These subjects include treaties, arbitral procedure, and regime of the high seas (which were topics given priority for codification), formulation of principles recognized in the charter and judgment of the Nürnberg Tribunal, preparation of a draft code of offenses against the peace and security of mankind, and desirability and possibility of establishing an international judicial organ for trial of persons charged with genocide or other crimes over which jurisdiction will be conferred by international conventions.

Commission for India and Pakistan

The Commission for India and Pakistan reported June 6 that the Governments of India and Pakistan have not acceded to the Commission's request for unreserved acceptance of truce terms presented by the Commission on April 28. The cease-fire agreement was accepted by the two governments on January 1, 1949, but up to the present, and after 4 months of discussion, an agreement for the implementation of the truce has not been reached. The principal difference between India's viewpoint and that of Pakistan relates to the disposition and withdrawal of troops from the State of Jammu and Kashmir so as to prepare the ground for holding a plebiscite to which both governments are committed.

At present the Commission is studying the replies of the two governments and will decide its future plans after considering all relevant factors.

Atomic Energy Commission

Following United States, United Kingdom, French, and Chinese arguments that continued discussion of previously rejected Soviet proposals for simultaneous conventions on prohibition and control of atomic energy would be futile, U. S. S. R. Delegate Malik told the working committee of the Atomic Energy Commission that the majority

should present new proposals which might form the basis for common agreement. A request by the Ukraine delegate for additional time to prepare a statement prevented the Committee from completing action on a Chinese resolution to conclude further discussion on previously defeated Soviet proposals, and debate was resumed on the 1948 General Assembly resolution instructing the Atomic Energy Commission to resume its study of "practicable and useful" subjects.

United States Delegate Frederick H. Osborn contended that the U. S. S. R. plan would have countries of good faith destroy their weapons before the control organ could determine whether weapons had been destroyed in states which had no such high motives. Mr. Malik repeated previous Soviet attitudes on the atomic energy question and charged the United States with a lack of desire for any convention to prohibit the manufacture and use of atomic arms.

Mr. Osborn replied to three questions posed by Mr. Malik in the discussion of the 1948 General Assembly resolution. The United States was not willing to have prohibition of atomic weapons go into effect prior to the establishment of an effective control system, Mr. Osborn asserted. He reaffirmed US support of the General Assembly approved majority plan. To a second query Mr. Osborn replied that the United States agreed to control by an international agency over all stages of production. He felt that if Mr. Malik misunderstood this aspect of the plan, "The Soviet Delegate should point out the paragraphs of the approved plan from which he draws other conclusions."

In reply to Mr. Malik's third question Mr. Osborn recalled that several delegations had participated in preparing the recommendations eventually approved by the Assembly and it would be impossible to call this plan "an atomic super-trust" controlled by the United States, since provision for the rights of nations had been placed in the projected treaty, thus reducing the control organ's power. Neither the United States nor any other nation could accept the inadequate control system proposed by the USSR, which would enable nations to control the production of nuclear fuels. Mr. Osborn concluded that "such a system would never remove the fear and mistrust which constitute a threat to peace."

Trade Negotiations

The Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), meeting at Annecy, France, since April 11, agreed that tariff

negotiations would have to be prolonged until the end of July and perhaps into August. Agreements are under consideration by 34 nations, the 23 original contracting parties to the GATT plus 11 acceding governments.

The contracting parties, resuming their debate on a Czechoslovak complaint against the United States export-license system, rejected the charge made by Czechoslovakia. Only Czechoslovakia cast a ballot supporting the charge in a roll call vote. The two main points of the debate were: Is the United States contravening the most-favored-nation treatment clause of the GATT? and What is the scope of the GATT article, which allows exceptions to most-favored-nation treatment for reasons of national security? The chairman ruled that the only question was "whether the United States has failed to carry out its GATT obligations in administering the export license system."

Commission on Human Rights

Continuing debate on the draft International Covenant of Human Rights and measures of implementation at nine meetings during the week, the Commission on Human Rights adopted five additional articles and postponed further discussion of implementation measures after rejecting by identical tie votes both the proposition that provision should be made for individual and group petitions and the proposition that such provision should not be included.

The approved articles pertain to the right of everyone to recognition everywhere as a person before the law; the right to freedom of religion; the right to freedom of peaceful assembly; and the right to freedom of association with others. On the basis of a proposal by Mrs. Roosevelt, U. S. Representative and Chairman, the Commission postponed action on the article relative to freedom of information pending completion of the convention now being considered by the Subcommittee on Freedom of Information.

The Commission by a vote of twelve to two (U.S.S.R., Ukraine), with France abstaining, tentatively concluded that the right to enter complaints with respect to human rights violations would be open to signatory states. Debate then shifted to the question of extending this right to individual groups and organizations, and opinions of the members were divided into three groups: (1) those who urged that the United Nations should recognize the right of individuals to file complaints on violations of human rights (Australia, Denmark, France, Guatemala, India, and Lebanon); (2) a group who felt that in the initial stages the right to petition the United Nations should be accorded only to States (China, Egypt, Iran, Philippines, the United Kingdom, and the United States); and (3) the third view expressed by U.S.S.R. and Ukrainian representatives that the United Nations should under no circumstances accord the right of petition to individuals.

Mrs. Roosevelt said that the Commission was devising an entirely new machinery for implementation of human rights and that access to this machinery should, as a first step, be confined to governments. If this machinery was to be overwhelmed at the very beginning by an unreasonably large number of petitions, it would prove unworkable. The Commission, Mrs. Roosevelt said, should first set up a provisional system, acknowledge frankly that this was as yet incomplete, and move on later to perfect it.

Subcommission on Freedom of Information

The subcommission on Freedom of Information and of the Press adopted a fifteen-item "program of work and priorities for the three-year period of life of the subcommission" and took action on several items.

In consideration of means by which the Subcommittee might receive information concerning current legislation and practices in the field of its competence, the subcommission called on governments to complete the questionnaires sent to them by the Secretariat and recommended that the Secretary-General be authorized to request governments to submit lists of nongovernmental organizations from which national press-freedom information might be obtained, to obtain information from them and from other nongovernmental organizations as the Subcommittee may decide.

The Subcommittee voted to receive and discuss complaints or criticism against states regarding their information principles or practices. Complaints may be made by "any legally constituted national or international press, information, broadcasting or newsreel enterprise or association" or from "any member of a professional organization . . . or any other legally constituted body" with competence in this field. Anonymous complaints will not be received, but individuals who send in complaints may be protected from public disclosure of their identity if they so request.

International Labor Organization

A twelve-point agenda has been prepared for the Thirty-second Session of the General Conference of the International Labor Organization (ILO), which opened in Geneva, June 8. Representatives of the governments, workers, and employers of most of ILO's 61 member countries are attending this meeting. ILO's Governing Body began its conference also in Geneva on June 3.

Among the subjects which the General Conference will consider are adoption of two conventions to aid migrant workers, vocational guidance standards, revision of working standards on shipboard, revision of the 1933 convention, which sought to abolish fee-charging employment agencies conducted with a view to profit and to regulate the operation of those not conducted for profit, and application of the principles of the right to organize and to bargain collectively.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

The Atmosphere of Neighborliness Between American States

BY AMBASSADOR ELLIS O. BRIGGS¹

The International Labor Organization occupies an enviable position as one of the most experienced and effective of international organizations. Its wisdom is nowhere more evident than in the organization of these regional conferences, held in recognition of the fact that different areas of the world have special interests in common and have special problems to solve. We accordingly warmly welcome the opportunities which this regional conference provides to discuss our own affairs among our own neighbors.

The people of the Americas are already experienced in international cooperation, and it is no disrespect to the excellent and mature ILO to point out that the Pan American Union antedates it by a full generation. Here in the New World—where so much remains to be done—we have nevertheless come as near, I am convinced, as any region of the world to answering that ancient exhortation, "My neighbor—let him enter into my house as my friend."

It is eminently fitting then that this meeting should take place in the free air of Uruguay. Here in Uruguay we can, as His Excellency the President pointed out in his eloquent opening address last Monday, "breathe the same freedom which sustains the people" of this country. Later he said, "Social justice without liberty for the citizens is a lie, and what is more serious, a dangerous lie."

The President spoke truly. In no part of the world is respect for the dignity of the individual more zealously cherished or more steadfastly guarded, by people and government alike, than it is in this progressive country, whose capital has generously—with true "hospitalidad oriental"—been placed at our disposal for the duration of this conference. Gentlemen, the atmosphere of freedom cannot be falsified or counterfeited. The presence of that atmosphere in Montevideo augurs well for the success of our deliberations.

We have noted the growing interest of the ILO in the affairs of this hemisphere. We desire to see the ILO and the Organization of American States, successor to the Pan American Union, work closely and harmoniously together. We

would suggest therefore that the Governing Body maintain contact with the Director General of the Organization of American States, with the object of concluding a draft agreement defining our relationship. This draft should be submitted for discussion and action to the responsible organs of the two organizations. Similarly, we look forward to an increasingly cooperative relationship between the ILO and the various commissions and committees affiliated with the Organization of American States.

Nations everywhere are going through a period of economic and social readjustment. Although the war took no toll in this hemisphere comparable to the catastrophic destruction in Europe and elsewhere, the fabric of the New World was strained in many directions. The durability of that fabric, the work of Artigas, of Bolívar, of Juárez, Martí, O'Higgins, San Martín, Sucre, Washington, and a host of other próceres and statesmen whose names are venerated from Tierra del Fuego to the Arctic Circle, is challenged today by a destructive philosophy, defense against which is the business—the very personal and vital business—of every member of this assembly and of every citizen of each and every country here represented.

It is a time for courage and for resolute action following calm and careful deliberation. It is only when we can detach ourselves and contemplate the basic issues that we can appreciate the long road which the peoples of America have traveled already as friends and neighbors. It is only true that we can map the terrain that lies ahead.

The rate at which we progress across this new terrain will be largely determined by the political and economic climate in which we live, and by our success in completing some of the readjustments which inevitably follow in the wake of devastating war. In my own country a postwar readjustment is in progress. Although nearly 60 million people are employed in industry and agriculture, some of our workers are experiencing periods of unemployment as markets become adjusted to postwar levels of demand. At present the number of unemployed in the United States is relatively low—about 5 percent of the labor force. Still, our factories and mines are producing at a rate only slightly below the latter part of 1948. Last year we had an extraordinarily bountiful harvest,

¹ Address delivered Apr. 29, 1949, at the Fourth Conference of American States Members of the ILO, in reply to the report of the Director General. Ambassador Briggs served as U.S. delegate to the Conference.

both of wheat and feed grains. With this continued volume, prices are declining somewhat, and already agricultural products have fallen almost 15 percent from the extraordinarily high levels which they reached in late 1947 and early 1948, after the failure of the corn crop in the United States and the small grain crops in Europe.

The Director General and the staff have given this conference a most comprehensive and enlightening report upon which to base our discussions. In our view, the keynotes of that report are the progress of economic development and the social programs with which it should be accompanied if we are to avoid many of the hardships, for industry and labor alike, that other countries have encountered. The report emphasizes the fundamental need for greater production in agriculture as well as in industry. It suggests policies for the recruitment and training of labor and for the safeguards essential thereto: regulation of hours of work, industrial hygiene, the establishment of minimum wages, avoidance of exploitation of women and young workers, and measures for social insurance.

In connection with this report I invite your attention particularly to the problems incident to future economic development. This is a subject in which the Government of the United States is profoundly interested. It is not long—it is only a moment in terms of history—since my country itself was one vast frontier. From our own experience over the past century and a half, we have learned something of the development of natural resources, of maintaining and increasing the capacity of the land, of industrial specialization, and of the technique of bringing these about under a system of free labor and free enterprise. We have learned—and God grant that the lesson may never be forgotten—that no progress is valid or is long sustained except in an atmosphere of individual freedom under law.

It is moreover our belief that the solution of many of the world's material problems lies in the use of advanced technology in industry, in agriculture, and in transportation.

With this in mind the President of the United States, in his inaugural address of January 20 of this year, proposed that the American people should support a broad program of technical collaboration, to be carried out through appropriate international agencies.

President Truman said:

"... we must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.

"... The material resources which we can afford to use for the assistance of other peoples are limited. But our imponderable resources in technical knowledge are constantly growing and are inexhaustible.

"Our aim should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.

"We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. . . . This should be a cooperative enterprise. . . . It must be a world-wide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom."

This problem is so vast that its solution requires that all nations contribute. It is a type of co-operation by which areas not hitherto developed can be aided through the efforts of their friends and their neighbors. It is long range in character. It is a program reciprocal in nature. It is a program the operational details of which will vary from country to country, and from zone to zone within countries, depending upon resources, governments, citizens, and, above all, the will reciprocally to collaborate. Some countries will develop along lines different from others, depending on geography, climate, resources, and the availability of raw materials. Not all will industrialize or industrialize to the same degree. Not all should do so.

Since many international organizations—including the ILO—have long had programs touching this matter, it would appear profitable to expand these existing programs. Accordingly, at the suggestion of the United States representative, the Economic and Social Council has requested that the Secretary-General of the United Nations prepare a concrete program for enlarging United Nations activities in the field of technical assistance for economic development. This program is now in preparation for consideration of the ninth session of the Council to be held in Geneva on July 5 next.

Clearly, among the international agencies, the ILO can play an important role in this expanded program, because of the importance of manpower in any economic development, and further, the importance of so directing that development that social standards may be safeguarded while living standards are being raised. In particular, in problems of manpower, recruitment, training, relocation, and the standards under which men work, the ILO can provide stimulating leadership and wise guidance.

The tripartite character of the ILO gives it special advantages. Here today are men who have themselves had experience in establishing and operating industries. Here today are men who as individuals have done the work in those plants with their own hands. The members of this tripartite body perhaps know better than any other international body what it means in human terms—to start a new industry, to train new workers, to provide the social safeguards that must accompany these new developments if they are to prosper.

It is our hope therefore that the ILO may extend its leadership by rapid and vigorous action within that part of the program for economic development which relates to labor and its functions within agriculture and industry. This is, in fact, nothing new for the ILO. It is an extension, an expansion, of an existing program.

There are many fields in which, in our estimation, active programs can be undertaken without delay. In fact, the Director General, in the preface to his report to the conference, has listed an impressive number. But since the funds of the ILO are limited and the staff equipped by job experience to engage in many of these programs not immediately available, it may be prudent for us to consider the selection of two or three fields of interest that should have primacy in the initial stages of the program. Take for example, programs for training. We surely all agree that manpower is fundamental to economic development; that the training of manpower in the use of new techniques—whether on the farm, in the factory, or in the mine—is basic. After the completion of the special survey of training needs in this region, the Governing Board may wish to formulate a series of specific training programs, each differing from country to country, from project to project, and also it need hardly be emphasized, each drafted in cooperation with each separate country concerned. I am confident that the International Labor Office, with its rich background of technical knowledge and with leaders in industry and labor throughout the hemisphere already attending this conference, can command the personnel needed to embark on such a program.

There are doubtless other areas within the competence of the ILO in which action is feasible and is urgently needed. Training programs are cited merely for illustration.

One great advantage of the ILO in such a program is that it can help assure the maintenance of high standards for workers. Take one example: industrialization draws women into paid employment. Countries in process of industrial development can see to it that women newly recruited into industry be not only well-trained, but that they have satisfactory working conditions, decent minimum wages, and fair hours. The program can thus contribute to avoiding the exploitation of women, which characterized the industrial revolution in many other areas.

As the program goes forward, it will also be evident that much can be gained from exchange of personnel, even by countries in which a relatively high degree of development has already taken place. For instance, part of the European Recovery Program involves furnishing technical assistance and expert service. Efforts are also being made to stimulate the exchange of technical assistance among participating countries, and between them and international agencies.

Among the American States, there has, of course, long been an interchange of experts in many fields, in which labor has been prominent. My country has participated in a wide range of projects. An Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation was established in Washington on the initiative of the Department of State 10 years ago, and it now coordinates the activities of 25 departments and agencies of my government, which carry on cooperative international technical projects, exchange of persons, and personnel training. Our Department of Labor is one of these agencies. Only 3 weeks ago the Secretary of Labor greeted 21 government officials and representatives from 13 other American countries who came to Washington for in-service training programs in labor law administration and industrial safety, statistical methods and techniques, and methods of improving working conditions and employment opportunities for women. Furthermore in the past year a number of representatives from that Department have gone to Latin America to consult and work with officials of other governments on similar programs in the labor field.

Through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, which administers programs in public health, agriculture, and education, formal agreements have for several years been negotiated covering projects to be undertaken by special agencies forming an integral part of the governments concerned, and in which technicians who are citizens of each country collaborate to carry out the program. Here in Uruguay there is such an agreement for cooperative work on public health. The recent joint Brazil-United States Technical Commission is another example.

Since the days of Columbus, Cortes, and Pizarro, it has always been characteristic of the Americas that they presented new frontiers to the world. In Latin America today your frontiers are both geographic and social. They include the undeveloped lands, the vast plains, the wind-driven cordillera, and all the resources still locked in the breast of the continent. There are mountains to conquer, plains to cross, treasures to discover. But there are also social frontiers, and they are no less challenging. It is our purpose, working together at this conference, to try to find ways to advance our economic and social frontiers simultaneously, both through helping to promote the evolution of areas not fully developed and through enhancing the welfare and efficiency of the people themselves. These objectives we believe we can best accomplish through the help and joint leadership of free industry, free labor, and free enterprise, working with governments under the international standards established for us all by this long-experienced tripartite organization.

The Director General has well declared that this is the time to act. The delegation of the United States is in wholehearted agreement.

U.S. Notes to Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania Invoke Peace Treaty Clauses To Settle Disputes on Violating Human Freedoms

[Released to the press June 11]

The United States Government, on April 2, 1949, formally charged the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania with violation of the respective clauses of the peace treaties obligating them to protect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of their peoples.¹ Having received unsatisfactory replies from the three Governments, the United States Government informed them on May 31, 1949, that disputes have arisen concerning the interpretation and execution of the respective peace treaties. In notes delivered by the American Legations in Sofia, Budapest, and Bucharest, the United States invoked the relevant treaty articles providing for the settlement of such disputes. The American Chiefs of Mission in the three capitals have requested their British and Soviet colleagues to meet with them to consider the disputes in accordance with the procedure specified in those articles (article 36 of the Bulgarian treaty, article 40 of the Hungarian treaty, and article 38 of the Rumanian treaty).

Similar action has been taken by the British Government. The Governments of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have associated themselves with the British notes.

The texts of the Bulgarian, Hungarian, and Rumanian replies to the United States notes of April 2, 1949, together with the texts of the United States notes delivered on May 31, are given below.² Copies of these documents have been made available to all signatories of the peace treaties.

Bulgarian Note to the United States

April 21, 1949

[Unofficial translation]

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has the honor to inform the Legation of the United States that it has taken cognizance of the tenor of the Legation's Note No. 130.

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has always carried out and will carry out in a most conscientious manner the clauses of the Peace Treaty and this not only because this

Government is signatory to the said Treaty, but also because its policy, expression of the will of the overwhelming majority of the Bulgarian people, is, by its inherent nature, profoundly democratic, and corresponds fully to the letter and spirit of Articles 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Peace Treaty.

1. Even before the entry into force of the Peace Treaty, the Bulgarian Government had undertaken all measures dependent on it (its will) for the guaranteeing of the fundamental civil liberties as well as the political rights of Bulgarian citizens, without distinction of race, nationality, sex or creed:

(a) This Government convoked, on the basis of universal, secret, equal and direct suffrage, a Grand National Assembly which elaborated the constitutional law of the country, and this Constitution did not only consecrate in a solemn manner the fundamental rights and freedoms of Bulgarian citizens—rights and freedoms which are subject matter of Article 2 of the Peace Treaty but also guaranteed their effective exercise.

(b) At the same time, this Government took the necessary measures for the definitive liquidation of the fascist regime and the elimination of every attempt to frustrate the nation of its democratic rights and freedoms. These measures of the Government were in conformance with the text itself of Article 4 of the Treaty, and moreover, the new Bulgarian Constitution which came into force on December 5, 1947, guaranteed to the Bulgarian people the necessary right and power to condemn to failure all attempts of fascist or anti-democratic restoration in Bulgaria. In the presence of such well-known facts, it is strange that the Government of the United States could formulate against Bulgaria accusations of non-observance and violation of the political clauses of the Peace Treaty, and of Article 2 of the said Treaty in particular.

2. Similarly, it is surprising that the Government of the United States has deemed it necessary to support its accusations of the Peace Treaty in force since September 15, 1947 by evoking facts going back to the Armistice period, at a time when the three great Powers disposed of measures to ex-

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 10, 1949, p. 450.

² Printed from telegraphic text.

ercise a wide control over the administration of the country.

3. On the other hand, the note of the United States Government relates to certain facts and acts of the Bulgarian Government, such as trials, etc., which have taken place after the entry into force of the Peace Treaty. The Bulgarian Government having taken all measures to ensure the compliance with all the political clauses of the Peace Treaty, and notably after Bulgaria had been granted the most democratic Constitution in the world, and the people had been guaranteed legal power to exercise and defend its rights and freedoms, the Bulgarian Government, as government of a sovereign state, cannot agree to permit other states the appreciation of its acts, for which it is solely responsible to the National Assembly. This Government can even less agree to suffer the criticism of foreign powers, in so far as the activities of Bulgarian courts are concerned, being (in existence) by virtue of the Constitution and functioning in public in accordance with the most modern and most democratic of laws.

The Bulgarian Government will repel every attempt of interference in the domestic affairs of Bulgaria and will consider as an unfriendly act any attempt to force it to accept treatment as a state whose internal acts would be subject to judgment by foreign powers.

4. As regards the essence of the accusations formulated in the note of the United States Government, the Bulgarian Government, without wishing to discuss their compass, rejects them energetically. Under the regime of people's democracy in Bulgaria, the toiling masses of towns and villages which constitute the immense majority of the nation, enjoy not only on paper but also in fact all fundamental political rights and freedoms of man. Restrictions on the exercise of the freedom of meeting or of association, of the freedom of speech or of press, do not exist and are not applied in Bulgaria excepting in the cases provided by the laws against infringers and in the interest itself of public security, maintenance of order, and public morals of the people.

In conclusion, the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers the note of the Honorable Legation of the United States as unfounded, and its tenor, rendered public by the United States Government immediately after it had been delivered and long before the present reply, as unfriendly propaganda, incompatible with the principles of international law, and of a nature to encourage the pro-fascist and hostile elements in the country.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria avails itself of this opportunity to reiterate to the Honorable Legation of the United States the assurance of its high consideration.

United States Note to Bulgaria

May 31, 1949

The Legation of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria and, acting under the instructions of the United States Government, has the honor to reply to the Ministry's note of April 21, 1949 concerning the question of Bulgaria's compliance with the obligations of Article 2 of the Treaty of Peace.

The United States Government, taking note of the Bulgarian Government's rejection of the statements made in the Legation's note of April 2, 1949, concerning Bulgaria's disregard of its obligations under Article 2, finds it necessary to place on record its view that the Bulgarian Government has not given a satisfactory reply to the specific charges set forth in the Legation's note. The Bulgarian Government has also failed to furnish the United States Government with the requested information as to measures which the Bulgarian Government is prepared to adopt in order to remedy the situation caused by the violation of its obligations under Article 2 and to implement fully the terms of that Article. The remaining portions of the Bulgarian Government's note of April 21 consist of allegations against the United States which are demonstrably false and irrelevant to the matter at hand.

The United States Government accordingly considers that a dispute has arisen concerning the interpretation and execution of the Treaty of Peace which the Bulgarian Government has shown no disposition to join in settling by direct diplomatic negotiations.

The American Minister has therefore been instructed by his Government to refer the dispute to his British and Soviet colleagues for consideration jointly with himself in accordance with the provisions of Article 36 of the Treaty of Peace. Copies of his letters to the Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to the British Minister inviting them to meet for this purpose are enclosed.

Hungarian Note to the United States

April 8, 1949

[Unofficial translation]

The Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has received the official note No. 360 of the Budapest Legation of the United States, dated April 2, and has the honor to give the following answer.

The Government of the United States accuses the Government of Hungary of violation of the Treaty of Peace referring, first of all, to Article 2, paragraph 1, which obliges Hungary to secure "to all persons under Hungarian jurisdiction, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms." It is well known that,

concerning the free enjoyment of human rights, the Republic of Hungary, well before the conclusion of the Treaty of Peace, abolished all discriminations as to race, sex, language and religion which existed under Horthy regime. Thus, the Government of Hungary has fully complied with the provisions of the Treaty of Peace. The Government of Hungary wishes to point out that it is the Government of the United States that launches the above reproaches against the Government of Hungary, whereas it is notorious that in the United States serious discrimination exists between citizens of different race and color and that, by far, not every person can equally enjoy human rights.

Further on the Government of the United States refers to Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Treaty of Peace, which, among other, obliges Hungary not to discriminate by her laws between Hungarian citizens interference to "their persons, property, business, professional or financial interests", et cetera. The Government of Hungary categorically protests such an interpretation of this Article of the Treaty of Peace which would dispute the legality of measures taken by this Government by which it has passed the large estates into the hands of the people and declared common property the capitalist monopolies. This kind of interpretation of the Treaty of Peace equals the defense of medieval latifundia, capitalist monopolies and their owners who were principal supporters of fascism in Hungary and at same time Hitler's most ardent henchmen in the war against the Allied and Associated Powers and thus against the United States. Consequently, the above interpretation of the Treaty of Peace does not only mean defense of large estates and capitalist monopolies, but also means that the Government of the United States wishes to help the adherents of the reactionary and fascist regime who were in power in Hungary and to hamper the successful democratic transformation of country.

The Government of Hungary calls the attention of the Government of the United States to Article 4 of the Treaty of Peace which explicitly obliges Hungary not only to dissolve the fascist organizations but also not to allow "the existence and activities or organizations of that nature which have as their aim denial to the people of their democratic rights." The Government of Hungary points out that it has been and is proceeding in the sense of these provisions of the Treaty of Peace, when dissolving the organizations and parties aiming at the restoration of the old Fascist regime and when summoning to the court those who pursue an activity to overthrow the democratic republic. The protest of the Government of the United States against the measures taken against fascist and anti-democratic organizations by the Government of Hungary, when fulfilling the provisions of the Treaty of Peace, makes it

obvious that it does not intend to ensure respect for the Treaty of Peace but wishes to extend its support to those reactionary and anti-democratic elements who would like to restore the rule of large estates and the monopolies in Hungary.

The Government of Hungary states that while the Republic of Hungary has rigorously observed the stipulations of the Treaty of Peace the Government of the United States repeatedly violated the provisions of the Treaty of Peace with Hungary. One of the military officials of the United States, General L. D. Clay, abrogated by a stroke of the pen Article 30 of the Treaty of Peace which stipulates that Hungarian property taken to Germany should be restituted. As a result of this violation of the Treaty of Peace, Hungarian property in the value of several hundred million forints got lost in the American occupation zone of Germany. Contrary to the stipulations of the Treaty of Peace and other international agreements, the American authorities several times refused extradition of Hungarian war criminals applied for by Hungary, on the one hand, and, on the other, they are giving full and official support to the most responsible Hungarian criminals of the fascist war, such as former Regent Miklos Horthy, Colonel General Ferenc Kisbarnaky Farkas, Lt. General Gusztav Henney, who waged war with the fascist methods also against the United States and are still openly professing fascism. The support systematically given by official quarters of the United States in the last years to conspiratory organizations of reactionary Hungarian politicians is also incompatible with the spirit of the Treaty of Peace. The Hungarian courts established as a fact that the Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States and other United States officials have actively collaborated with reactionary conspiratory organizations aiming at the overthrow of the democratic Republic of Hungary, recognized by the Treaty of Peace, and desirous of restoring the old regime brand-marked in the Treaty of Peace.

The Government of Hungary declares once more that Hungary has fulfilled, fulfills and will fulfill all obligations embodied in the Treaty of Peace. At same time, the Government of Hungary emphatically protests the tendency of the Government of the United States to use the stipulations of the Treaty of Peace as a pretext for illegitimate interference in the domestic affairs of the sovereign Hungarian state and for supporting reactionary and fascist forces opposed to the Government of Hungary. On the basis of the above exposed arguments the Hungarian Government considers the note of the United States an attempt at illegitimate interference in the domestic affairs of this country and a new phase in the campaign of reactionary incitement pursued by the imperialist quarters of the United States in the service of their

aims threatening peace and directed against the Hungarian people's democracy.

For these reasons Hungary emphatically rejects the note of the Government of the United States.

United States Note to Hungary

May 31, 1949

The Legation of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Hungary and, acting under instructions of the United States Government, has the honor to reply to the Ministry's note of April 8, 1949, concerning the question of Hungary's compliance with the obligations of Article 2 of the Treaty of Peace.

The United States Government, taking note of the Hungarian Government's rejection of the statements made in the Legation's note of April 2, 1949, concerning Hungary's disregard of its obligations under Article 2, finds it necessary to place on record its view that the Hungarian Government has not given a satisfactory reply to the specific charges set forth in the Legation's note. The Hungarian Government has also failed to furnish the United States Government with the requested information as to measures which the Hungarian Government is prepared to adopt in order to remedy the situation caused by the violation of its obligations under Article 2 and to implement fully the terms of that Article. The United States Government cannot accept the Hungarian Government's contention that the matters dealt with in the United States note are purely domestic affairs or the contention that Hungary has complied with the obligations of Article 2 of the Treaty of Peace merely by the formal repeal of the discriminatory legislation of the Horthy regime. Nor can the United States Government agree that violations of Article 2 can be excused by reference to Hungary's obligations under Article 4 of the Treaty. Persecution of all political leaders and parties not amenable to the dictates of the minority ruling group and denial of freedom of expression cannot properly be justified under any Article of the Treaty.

The remaining portions of the Hungarian Government's note of April 8, including references to other Articles of the Treaty of Peace, consist of allegations against the United States which are demonstrably false and irrelevant to the matter at hand. The United States Government rejects categorically the unwarranted accusations that it has supported reaction and conspiracies in Hungary, accusations which will not obscure the real issues raised by the United States note of April 2.

The United States Government accordingly considers that a dispute has arisen concerning the interpretation and execution of the Treaty of Peace which the Hungarian Government has

shown no disposition to join in settling by direct diplomatic negotiations.

The American Minister has therefore been instructed by his Government to refer the dispute to his British and Soviet colleagues for consideration jointly with himself in accordance with the provisions of Article 40 of the Treaty of Peace. Copies of his letters to the Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to the British Minister inviting them to meet for this purpose are enclosed.

Rumanian Note to the United States

April 18, 1949

[Unofficial translation]

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs presents its compliments to the Legation of the United States and has the honor to transmit the following on behalf of the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic.

On April 2 the Legation of the United States in Bucharest presented a note to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Rumanian People's Republic on behalf of the American Government in which as in former notes certain affirmations were made by the Government of the United States with reference to violation by the Rumanian Government of the provisions of Article 3 of the Peace Treaty.

The Government of the Rumanian People's Republic maintains that the context of the note of the United States Government with reference to the violation by the Rumanian Government of human rights and of fundamental freedoms does not correspond to reality and that it repeats the inventions of the slanderous press of the imperialist monopolists.

In the Rumanian People's Republic the exercise of the fundamental freedoms, freedom of assembly, of demonstrations, of the press and of speech are guaranteed by the Constitution and these are assured by making available to those who work the means of printing, supply of paper and meeting places.

Discrimination because of nationality or race is punishable by law.

Religious organizations enjoy freedom of worship and are given the places and means necessary for the exercise of their religion.

Thus the laws of the Rumanian People's Republic in fact guarantee the application of the provisions of Article 3 of the Peace Treaty.

The Rumanian Government declares that the United States Government has transgressed and is transgressing the Peace Treaty with Rumania by trying to prevent the application of Article 5 of the Peace Treaty which provides that the Rumanian Government will not permit the existence or activity of any organizations of a fascist type

and which aim at depriving the people of their democratic rights.

The Note of the United States Government in support of its affirmation cites steps taken by the Rumanian Government against fascist remnants as well as the sentences pronounced by the courts of the Rumanian People's Republic against the groups of spies and saboteurs in the service of the American Espionage Service.

The public trials of these bands composed of the leaders of the former National Peasant Party, legionnaires, large landowners and great industrialists who tried to transform Rumania into a new breeding ground of war, have shown beyond any doubt that these persons received instructions from and were led by members of the United States Mission in Bucharest. Even the American press has admitted that their discovery and their sentencing constituted a blow to the American Espionage services.

The Rumanian Government declares that the United States Government is encouraging the activities and the organization of fascist fugitives, of squanderers of public funds, of traitors from Rumania who are in the United States or on territory under American control by granting asylum, by placing at their disposal official radio channels, etc.

Under these circumstances, the Rumanian Government declares that the note of the United States Government, as well as former notes, endeavors to lead astray world public opinion which condemns its policy of racial discrimination, its barbarous acts of lynching, its drowning out of democratic political opinion, its trials of men of culture and representatives of the working people who fight for democracy and peace, its incitement to war and policy of aggressive pacts, its nurturing of breeding grounds of war, and its support of fascist bands which kill women and children *en masse*, all of which are in reality a brutal violation of the fundamental rights and liberties of man.

In consequence, the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic declares that it cannot accept the attempt of the United States Government to interfere in the internal affairs of Rumania and it rejects the note of the Government of the United States.

United States Note to Rumania

May 31, 1949

The Legation of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Rumania and, acting under the instructions of the United States Government, has the honor to reply to the Ministry's note of April 18, 1949 concerning the question of Rumania's compliance with the obligations of Article 3 of the Treaty of Peace.

June 12, 1949

Statement by Acting Secretary Webb

[Released to the press June 1]

On May 31 our representatives delivered in Sofia, Budapest, and Bucharest notes invoking those clauses of the peace treaties which provide procedures for the settlement of disputes. Disputes have arisen between the United States and these governments over their failure to comply with their peace treaty obligations to secure to their citizens the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms. You may recall that on April 2 the United States and British Governments formally charged Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania with violating these obligations. Their replies, as you will see by the texts released June 1, fail to answer these charges satisfactorily and show no willingness to remedy the situation. A large part of each reply consists of familiar propaganda statements and of false accusations against the United States. We shall not be distracted from the main issue by such tactics. We intend to proceed, according to the treaty procedures, first, to American-British-Soviet consultations in the three capitals and later, if necessary to the appointment of commissions to consider the disputes and render decisions.

The charges which we have made are serious ones involving not only the violation of binding treaty obligations but also the denial to whole peoples of their fundamental liberties. This government, acting in the interests of the states signatory to the treaties and of world opinion as expressed in the recent General Assembly resolution on the subject, will press for a full hearing and for the assessment of responsibilities.

The United States Government, taking note of the Rumanian Government's rejection of the statements made in the Legation's note of April 2, 1949, concerning Rumania's disregard of its obligations under Article 3, finds it necessary to place on record its view that the Rumanian Government has not given a satisfactory reply to the specific charges set forth in the Legation's note. The Rumanian Government has also failed to furnish the United States Government with the requested information as to measures which the Rumanian Government is prepared to adopt in order to remedy the situation caused by the violation of its obligations under Article 3 and to implement fully the terms of that Article. The United States Government cannot accept the Rumanian Government's contention that the matters dealt with in the United States note are purely domestic affairs or the contention that Rumania has complied with the obligations of Article 3 of the Treaty of Peace merely by the formal enactment of laws purporting to guarantee the application of the provisions of that Article. The remaining portions of the Rumanian Government's note of April 18, including references to other Articles of the Treaty of Peace, consist of allegations against the United States which are demonstrably false and irrelevant to the matter at hand. The United States Government rejects categorically the unwarranted accusations that it has supported reaction and conspiracies in

Rumania, accusations which will not obscure the real issues raised by the United States note of April 2.

The United States Government accordingly considers that a dispute has arisen concerning the interpretation and execution of the Treaty of Peace which the Rumanian Government has shown no disposition to join in settling by direct diplomatic negotiations.

The American Minister has therefore been instructed by his Government to refer the dispute to his British and Soviet colleagues for consideration jointly with himself in accordance with the provisions of Article 38 of the Treaty of Peace. Copies of his letters to the Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to the British Minister inviting them to meet for this purpose are enclosed.

Goals and Practical Problems of the Point-4 Program

ADDRESS BY JOHN R. STEELMAN¹

Assistant to the President

I am happy to be in Chicago again and to have this opportunity to talk to you about what has come to be known as the Point-4 program. Every day it is becoming more apparent that the concept underlying this program holds promise of untold benefit for the entire world.

This concept was first outlined by President Truman in his inaugural address. He stated that we must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and our industrial programs available for the improvement and growth of economically underdeveloped areas of the world.

The President called upon other countries to share in this effort, which he said must be a world-wide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom.

The President's words produced an electric effect around the globe. They were at the same time a challenge and a promise. Not a promise of what the United States can do for the world, but a promise of what all freedom-loving people, working together, can accomplish for themselves.

In talking about the Point-4 program, I want not only to discuss its goals and potentialities but also the practical problems which confront us when we come to translate this concept into action.

At the outset it should be stated that when we refer to a country as economically underdeveloped, we do not mean to reflect on it in any unfavorable way. A number of countries with rich cultural heritages, and which rank high in the community of civilized nations, badly need to bring their resources and the skills of their people to higher levels of economic productivity.

Another point to clarify at the outset is that Point 4 is not a recovery program. It is not a reconstruction program. It is not designed to

build up again something torn down or ravaged by war.

Point 4 is a development program, and to that extent a creative enterprise. Its purpose is not to restore living standards but to raise them where they are below the traditional levels enjoyed in many other parts of the world.

Point 4 is a logical forward step in our program of international cooperation.

In the first postwar years, our attention was centered on the devastated areas of Europe. It was necessary to help bring order out of the chaos and debris of the war-shattered cities of Western Europe and to lend a helping hand to many other war-weary peoples.

Today the economy of Europe is on the road to recovery. But to secure stability for the world, it is necessary to give attention to the economic development of other areas. For peace, we know, is not divisible, and the economic insecurity of peoples in some far corner of the earth may imperil our own safety.

Since the end of the war, the people in many of the less developed countries have made great strides toward social and political democracy. In many cases their continued progress will depend upon their material welfare. Safeguarding their economic rights—and assuring them a participation in the business affairs of the world that will be of mutual benefit—is one of the major international problems today.

It is the intention of the United States, in embarking on the Point-4 program, to assist those freedom-loving countries which seek and desire our economic cooperation. It will be our policy to aid in the establishment of programs which will meet the varying needs of the countries seeking assistance. For different countries have different needs.

It has been made clear by the President that our intention is not that of duplicating our own economy or imposing our own patterns of business and

¹ Made before the Joint Luncheon of the Executives Club of Chicago and the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, at Chicago on May 27, 1949, and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

social life on the peoples of other countries. The work to be undertaken must serve the national aspirations, social customs, and economic needs of the peoples involved.

The objective of Point 4 is not to change the economy of any country over night. Rather, our contribution should vitalize the effort of the country in the development of its own resources. I keep hearing the term "show-how," and that is what we must do at first.

In Washington I am often asked if Point 4 does not carry the danger of creating industries which will compete with our own. I think we have only to look back upon the history of our trade with Europe and Latin America to see the folly of such fears. Certainly for the foreseeable future, the economic development of other areas will require capital goods from the United States. Also, the Point-4 program will aid in developing the world trading system which is necessary for the growth of our own economy and the future prosperity of all nations.

Point 4 has its forerunners in many activities of both government and of private organizations, which are now being carried on in underdeveloped areas. Private business has carried on developments which have added to the wealth and well-being of distant parts of the world, and our government has provided technical assistance in various lines to governments seeking to improve the standards of living of their people.

The significance of the Point-4 program is that major emphasis is to be placed upon this type of activity. What have been the scattered activities of business and government are to be brought together and made a major part of our foreign policies. The requirements of the underdeveloped areas far outstrip anything we have heretofore been able to do. It is important to attack the problem as a whole and to understand that technical assistance and overseas development will have constantly increasing importance for years to come.

Many fine examples of what can be done through Point 4 are before us already in the work which has been carried out by American businessmen in South America and elsewhere. Projects supported by American capital include lumber camps in South America, palm oil in the Belgian Congo, rubber plantations in Liberia. American capital has developed railroads in Brazil and mines in Bolivia.

In many parts of the world today where American capital has aided in developing the natural resources, it has contributed more significantly in developing the human resources. Stamping out yellow fever and malaria has been good business. It has been good business also to build schools for training able workers.

Royalties on oil produced by American capital have made possible fine hospitals and schools in Venezuela. The first railroad ever to be con-

structed in Saudi Arabia is being built by American capital and paid for from oil royalties.

American capital has assisted many areas in the creation of a broader trading system, enabling the people to exchange their goods in larger volume and on better terms with others.

An outstanding development of this kind has been made possible through the Venezuelan Basic Economy Corporation. One of its many projects assisted in building up the fishing industry. On the one hand new fishing methods with modern equipment and refrigeration were introduced. On the other hand, retail outlets were created for the increased production, modern marketing methods were taught, and new ways of using the fishery products were developed.

In addition, much international assistance has been rendered by private nonprofit organizations. The international exchange of students and the extensive medical research made possible by universities and private foundations have contributed greatly to the development of technical knowledge in other countries. The far-flung medical and agricultural services of the various mission societies have also made an immense contribution to the technical skills of people in underdeveloped areas.

The Government as well as private organizations has aided in foreign economic development. The Department of Agriculture has provided technical assistance to other countries for more than a decade, and today through cost-sharing arrangements with the countries concerned, is assisting in more than 300 agricultural research projects in Latin America. On a similar basis, technical missions in agriculture have been sent to nearly a score of countries.

The Public Health Service has provided experts to assist many countries in solving problems of disease and pest control, maternal and child health, and nutrition; and the Federal Works Agency has provided assistance on transportation, engineering, and sewage projects. Altogether 25 agencies of the Government are now working with foreign governments in economic projects of various kinds.

Point 4 has a definite precedent also in such enterprises as the Joint Brazil-United States Technical Mission which conducted a survey of Brazil's development needs last year. Moreover, it has a definite relationship to our other programs of international cooperation, such as the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Program.

The President stated that the Point-4 program must be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies wherever practicable. We are today cooperating with other countries and assisting them through our work in the United Nations Economic and Social Council, the Unesco, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the In-

ternational Labor Office, the World Health Organization, and others.

These are some of the things that are being done now. Our forward planning for the carrying out of the Point-4 program envisages several phases of effort. It is not merely an expansion of what we are doing at the present moment—we must formulate an integrated policy which will be the framework of our effort 5, 10, and 20 years in the future.

The first step in many areas will undoubtedly be to conduct an expert survey in the various fields that are basic to economic development—such as transportation, health, education, communications, and water resources. Only by surveying “from the ground up” can future projects be integrated into a practical program. Lack of development in such basic fields imposes real limits on the rate at which capital investment can be absorbed in most underdeveloped sections of the world.

In some of these areas, basic improvements in health and education will have to precede any real advances in other fields necessary to a stable economy. The ultimate objective of an education program in such areas would be to fit the people to understand and make the most of their environment and to enable them to become useful workers and citizens. The importance of introducing modern health techniques is obvious. It is impossible for malaria-ridden areas, for instance, to develop their full potentialities.

Introduction of modern agricultural techniques will increase food production and make possible a better diet. Conservation of the soil will increase arable areas. Development of a system of transportation will open up new markets. And the development of mining, industry, and agriculture would provide decent jobs for millions now living at bare subsistence levels.

In many countries the scope of the capital investment which could profitably be utilized is tremendous. In India, for instance, already the most highly industrialized area of the Far East, there is a great need for railroads and railroad equipment, and for hydroelectric projects. In Africa, transportation and port facilities might open up enormous possibilities for the development of the entire continent.

Much of the capital investment required at the outset will undoubtedly be of a type not ordinarily handled directly by private enterprise. The need for roads, port facilities, drainage and irrigation projects—to name only a few—is normally satisfied through government obligations, sold to other governments, international agencies, or the investing public in highly developed countries. Moreover, especially in the underdeveloped areas which can most fruitfully benefit from the Point-4 program, needs of this type must be met before private investment can be made effective.

In the early stages of the program, it is not

expected that the rate of private investment abroad will be substantially greater than at present. However, ultimately the export of American capital is certain to increase enormously.

Last year U.S. net private investment abroad—including Europe—was approximately 850 million dollars. One business group has estimated that given favorable circumstances, U.S. private industry by 1952 should be able annually to invest abroad approximately 2 billion dollars net. I believe that private investment will go beyond this estimate when the proper understanding and stability have been achieved.

Government direction and assistance are necessary, particularly in the planning and development stages, but the ultimate success of Point 4 necessarily will in great part depend upon the ability of American businessmen to supply the wants of the underdeveloped areas through the wise use of American private capital.

There are certain major questions relating to the role of private business in the program which must be given serious and immediate consideration by the business community. How much lending will be required? How much lending can private business undertake? What incentives are needed? What controls should be exercised, and through what means, to protect the investments abroad? What will be the impact on our own economy of a broad program of economic cooperation?

The problems are complex. The countries which stand most in need of assistance are poor countries. Ways must be found to bring hidden capital to light, to modernize systems of finance and fiscal policy in order to make it possible for the countries to utilize Point 4 on a self-help basis. The experiences of American businessmen in international affairs up to now will make their service and advice to these countries invaluable.

We must bring together and utilize the best American scientific, technical, and business experts in order to formulate and carry out a program of the scope required. We have had many helpful suggestions from business groups and individuals. We hope that we will have more.

It is essential that two difficulties be overcome before private investment can make its maximum contribution to the Point-4 program. Both concern the “climate” for investments. There is the question of discrimination through unfair taxation, expropriation, or other abuse of American capital in foreign countries. Private enterprise must be assured that its investments anywhere will receive equal treatment with any other investments in the country.

Secondly, it is equally necessary that the countries be assured that the imported capital will improve their standard of living and will not exploit their people, destroy their resources, or impair their independence or political integrity. As the President has made clear, imperialism has no place in Point 4.

In addition, it will be necessary to deal with the problem of convertibility into dollars of the returns from foreign investment. Today many countries are unable to earn even the dollars they need to pay for the most necessary imports. As you know, there has been considerable discussion in Congress and elsewhere of the possibility of United States Government guaranties against the extraordinary risks peculiar to foreign investment, particularly in connection with the convertibility of local currency derived from such investment. This is a subject involving difficult, and to some extent unpredictable, elements, and it may be that it can best be approached through an experimental program, involving limited liabilities, through which a workable technique for insuring against such risks can gradually be developed.

The Government is now at work on programs of technical assistance which in many areas must precede any extensive capital investment—public and private. A program is being drawn up to provide for the supplying of technical assistance in accordance with the Point-4 program through existing governmental and United Nations channels.

I want to make it very clear, however, that these proposals for technical assistance are only the first step, the initial breaking of the ground, in what will become a major effort of government and business together to help the peoples of the world to help themselves.

However great the effort we put into the development of Point 4, the effort of the people in the underdeveloped areas must be immeasurably greater. The manpower, the money, and the skills that first developed our country came in large part from abroad. But what was started by others gained momentum through our own efforts.

As in our own country, the development of the resources of the world may be assisted by others, but must rest primarily on local initiative.

One of the forms of self-help that other countries can provide is to undertake the basic economic surveys and studies which are necessary before programs of technical assistance or investment can be begun. The assistance which the United States can render will be expedited and greatly facilitated, if the countries which wish to participate in the Point-4 program undertake such studies and surveys without delay.

In laying their basic plans for future development, it is also important that the underdeveloped

countries avoid the dangers of trying to establish self-sufficient economic units. We must not foster plans that will create nationalistic barriers which impede social and economic progress in other countries. Some arrangement whereby a review of development plans may be undertaken by other countries, perhaps under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, would be helpful in avoiding these dangers and increasing production and international trade.

In the process of carrying forward this program, so wisely proposed by the President of the United States, we will gain new experience in the application of American engineering and scientific skill. We shall certainly advance our own technology. The challenging problems in many undeveloped parts of the world may test our vision and teach us much of enduring value that will advance our principles of management and investment.

Our aim in this enterprise is to help the freedom-loving peoples of the economically depressed parts of the world to raise their standard of living. By so doing we not only aid them in realizing their aspirations for a better life, but we shall be laying foundations for our own continued growth and prosperity.

Beyond the material rewards derived from this program, lies the broad vista which it opens—a better civilization whose motive force is no longer fear, but hope.

Economic and Social Council—Continued from page 744

63. World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts, The
64. World Federation of Democratic Youth
65. World Jewish Congress
66. World Movement of Mothers
67. World Power Conference
68. World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union
69. World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations
70. World's Young Women's Christian Association

iii. International organizations in category (c)

1. International Federation of Secondary Teachers
2. Lions International—International Association of Lions Clubs
3. Rotary International
4. World Organization of the Teaching Profession

Labor Strikes in Bolivian Tin-Mining Areas

STATEMENT BY ACTING SECRETARY WEBB

[Released to the press June 1]

For several months labor has been extremely restive at the Bolivian tin-mining area of Catavi, the property of the Patino Company. The basis of the trouble has been a jurisdictional dispute between the National Mine Workers Federation, headed by Juan Lechin, and an independent union. The leaders of the National Mine Workers Federation are controversial political figures allied with the extremist, Movimiento Nacional Revolucionario (MNR) political party, which was overthrown by a popular revolt in 1946.

American Fatalities

[Released to the press May 31]

The Department of State was distressed to learn of the grave developments which took place at the Catavi tin mines in Bolivia on May 28 and 29 resulting in many fatalities. According to reports received from the American Embassy in La Paz, two Americans were killed, John H. O'Conner and Albert Krefling, and two others seriously injured, William J. Cook and Pat Green. A fifth American, T. H. Peterson, has disappeared. The Department has instructed the American Embassy in La Paz to express the sympathy of this government to the widows of the two men killed, and also to the two injured Americans, and to spare no effort to locate the missing American.

The Embassy has also been requested to express to the Bolivian Government sympathy for the loss of Bolivian lives and appreciation for the steps taken to remove Americans from the scene of the difficulties.

A congressional election was held on May 1 during which MNR adherents fomented disorders in La Paz which resulted in 11 deaths. MNR agitators seized a district police station and were in control of it for several hours. This and other developments convinced the Bolivian Government that a plot existed to overthrow it by forceful means.

The night of May 26, the Bolivian Cabinet decided that in order to forestall imminent revolution it would deport from Bolivia certain labor leaders affiliated with MNR as well as former army officers and others suspected of being involved in the revolutionary plot. On May 27 and 28, a considerable number of persons were arrested and exiled to Chile. Included were Juan Lechin and a number of other labor leaders alleged to be involved in the MNR plot.

Immediately the workers at Siglo XX, a mine in the Catavi area, quit work. They seized 15 of the supervisory personnel including 7 Americans and held them in the union headquarters allegedly as hostages for the release of Lechin and other union leaders. Many of these hostages were badly beaten and several of them, including two Americans, were murdered. Bolivian army units have been stationed at Catavi for about 2 months, or since the situation became tense. Reinforced by other troops from Oruro, they captured the union headquarters about noon, May 29. By means of Bolivian Air Force planes and United States Military Attaché and Air Mission planes most of the Americans in the Catavi area were evacuated to Oruro on May 29 and 30. Two Americans who were badly injured while being held as hostages remained, together with their wives, at the hospital in Catavi. It is planned to evacuate them also when they are able to travel. The American manager of the Patino enterprises at Catavi, D. C. Deringer, has remained there. Apparently the Bolivian Army has been in control of the area since May 29.

Strikes or threats of strikes have occurred in practically all the other mining centers of Bolivia. In Colquiri, a Hochschild mining property, and Huanuni, another Patino mine, management personnel were seized and held as hostages. Those at Huanuni were rescued by Bolivian Army units about noon, May 31. Every effort is being made to obtain the release of the management hostages at Colquiri. A number of the hostages in each case are American citizens.

Immediately upon receiving word of the first developments at Catavi, the American Chargé d'Affaires in La Paz, James Espy, requested the Bolivian Government to provide American citizens throughout Bolivia with the fullest protection possible. On May 30 he sent urgent word to all the mining centers advising American citizens to evacuate their wives and children to the centers of population and to leave themselves if at all possible. By means of a plane chartered by the Patino Company, a plane owned by the Aramayo Company, and planes of our Military Air Attaché and the United States Air Mission in Bolivia, American management personnel and their families are being evacuated to places of safety as rapidly as possible. The number of persons evacuated from Catavi was approximately 140.

The wave of strikes does not appear to have subsided. Railway workers are reported to have

planned to strike at noon, May 31. The Bolivian Government the morning of May 31 had hopes of maintaining at least limited service on the La Paz Arica Railway and the La Paz Guaqui Railway, which are links with Chile and Peru. The Bolivian air line, LAB, struck May 27 but returned to work later.

On May 31 the Bolivian Government issued a decree declaring a state of siege covering the whole country. The decree stated that violent happenings in different parts of the country are creating a state of civil war.

The American Embassy in La Paz is continuing to exert every effort to secure the safety of American citizens in the mining districts. To date there have been no reports of disturbances in the principal centers of population which are La Paz, Oruro, Cochabamba, and Sucre.

Acting under instructions, the American Chargé d'Affaires in Bolivia on May 30 expressed to the Bolivian Government sympathy for the loss of Bolivian lives and appreciation for the steps taken to remove Americans from the scene of the difficulties. On May 31 the Bolivian Ambassador in Washington expressed the profound regret of his government at the death of the two murdered Americans.

American Community Activities Continue in Shanghai

Statement by John M. Cabot¹

So far as we have been able to ascertain no Americans have been injured in the course of fighting in or around Shanghai. All reports so far indicate that the Communist soldiers have respected Americans and their property despite certain relatively minor difficulties which have arisen in a few instances.

The American community, both business and philanthropic, is carrying on and intends to continue to do so insofar as this is permitted by the new authorities. They feel that their activities are a benefit to China as well as the organizations they represent. They will, I am confident, respect the laws and regulations instituted as required by the new authorities in their public announcements.

It will be necessary to wait until the new authorities have established the policies which they propose to follow before it is possible to say whether the American community can look to the future with optimism, but the community's first reactions have been distinctly favorable. For those who have suffered tragic losses in the hostilities which have swept over Shanghai the American community feels deeply sympathetic; it is fervently thankful for the greater horrors from which Shanghai has happily been spared.

June 12, 1949

"Siam" Officially Changed to "Thailand"

Text of communiqué transmitted by the American Embassy at Bangkok which was officially broadcast on May 11

Following the announcement made by the Premier's Office on September 7, 1945, to the effect that the name of the kingdom be called in English "Siam" and the people of the kingdom called "Siamese", the present government has again taken this matter into consideration.

Because of the fact that the present constitution calls the kingdom "Prates Thai" by name, the present Government is of the opinion that for convenience sake, the name of the kingdom is to be called "Thailand" in English and other languages and the name of the people living in the kingdom "Thai".

This announcement is being officially made May 11, 1949, and signed by the Premier, Field Marshal P. Phibun Songgram.

Letters of Credence

Hashemite Jordan Kingdom

The newly appointed Minister of the Hashemite Jordan Kingdom, Dr. Yussef Haikal, presented his credentials to the President on June 1. For texts of the Minister's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 406 of June 1, 1949.

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Transmitted to Senate

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, formulated at the International Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Conference and signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949 by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and by the plenipotentiaries of certain other governments.²

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State regarding this convention, and a certified copy of the Final Act of the Conference. The Final Act does not require ratification.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 9, 1949.

¹ Released to the press by the American Embassy in Shanghai on May 27, 1949. Printed from telegraphic text. Mr. Cabot is Consul General of the American Embassy at Shanghai.

² For text of the convention see *Documents and State Papers* for March and April 1949, p. 711.

Cuba Grants Renegotiations of Certain Tariff Concessions

[Released to the press June 3]

The Department of State announced on October 11, 1948, that Cuba had requested the renegotiation of certain tariff concessions granted by Cuba in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.¹ Cuba has now requested that its concession on certain colored-woven textiles be similarly renegotiated.

At the second session of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, held at Geneva in the summer of 1948, the contracting parties recommended, and the United States agreed, that renegotiation of preferential tariff concessions accorded to the United States by Cuba on certain colored-woven textiles should be undertaken if Cuba so requested. These colored-woven textiles are listed as items 114 to 117 and 132 to 135, part II, schedule IX (the Cuban schedule), of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Consideration will therefore be given by the United States to possible adjustments of the Cuban rates of duty applicable to colored-woven textiles provided for in the third note to each of these items.

As recommended by the contracting parties, the negotiations will include consideration of any new concessions, whether or not in respect of an item now in the Cuban schedule which Cuba might grant to the United States in return for any modifications of the duties on colored-woven textiles that might be agreed to by this government. Consideration will also be given to the possible withdrawal or partial withdrawal of some concessions which the United States granted to Cuba in schedule XX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. If such concessions are to be withdrawn, another announcement with respect thereto will be made.

Views of any interested persons with regard to these renegotiations should be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which is the Committee established to receive views on trade-agreement matters, no later than June 24, 1949. All communications on these matters should be addressed to: The Secretary, Committee for Reciprocity Information, Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D.C.

Convention With Costa Rica Establishing Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission

A convention between the United States and Costa Rica for the establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission was signed on May 31 in Washington.² This action came as a result of a conference between representatives of the two countries held in Washington last week.

Signing on behalf of the United States were Acting Secretary of State James E. Webb, and W. M. Chapman, Special Assistant for Fisheries to the Under Secretary of State. Señor Don Mario A. Esquivel, Ambassador of Costa Rica, and Señor Don Jorge Hazera, Counselor of the Costa Rican Embassy, signed on behalf of Costa Rica.

The convention provides for a joint Commission empowered to undertake the scientific investigation of yellowfin and skipjack tuna and of anchovetta and other bait fishes in the eastern Pacific Ocean in the fisheries maintained by the nationals of the two countries. Other kinds of fish taken by tuna fishing vessels may also be studied by the Commission. Much remains to be known about yellowfin and skipjack tuna and the other species concerned before the need for conservation measures may be determined.

The convention differs in a number of respects from the United States-Mexican tuna agreement signed last January in Mexico City. It covers particularly the tuna fisheries in the tropical waters of the eastern Pacific Ocean. In addition, unlike all of the fisheries concerned in the United States-Mexican agreement, the fisheries included in the present convention present problems of interest to a number of countries besides the signatories. Accordingly, the convention provides a new departure by making possible the adherence of other governments whose nationals operate in the fisheries involved. It is hoped that these other governments will join the United States and Costa Rica in the cooperative program for maintaining the populations of the fishes concerned at a level which will permit maximum sustained catches year after year.

Air Transport Agreement With Canada Signed

It was announced June 5 that the delegations representing the United States and Canadian Governments, which have during the past week been discussing bilateral air arrangements between the two countries, have concluded and signed a new bilateral air agreement on scheduled air services to replace the one presently in effect which was signed early in 1945.³

The new agreement differs from its predecessor in form in that it adopts the pattern for bilateral agreements that has been evolving in recent years. This pattern, which is based on certain standard articles developed at the Chicago International Air Conference in 1944, is known generally as the Bermuda-type agreement since the first agreement

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 24, 1948, p. 527.

² For text of convention, see Department of State press release 400 of May 31, 1949.

³ For text of agreement, see Department of State press release 414 of June 5, 1949.

of this type was concluded in Bermuda between the United States and the United Kingdom.

The new agreement provides for the exercise of traffic rights in each country by scheduled airlines of the other on certain agreed international through routes. Certain changes were made in the existing network of transborder air services between the two countries.

The changes in transborder services are that the United States has been granted a direct route between New York and Toronto, replacing its existing route from Buffalo to Toronto. This route will directly parallel the existing Canadian route from Toronto to New York. The United States has also received a route from Great Falls, Montana, to Edmonton, Alberta, which may be operated in conjunction with the existing United States service from Great Falls to Lethbridge.

Canada has received a direct route from Montreal to New York which will directly parallel the existing United States route between New York and Montreal.

Under these arrangements carriers of both countries may both operate between the largest city in the United States and the two largest cities in Canada. In other respects the existing pattern of transborder services is not changed.

In addition the United States has been granted two international through routes, the first from the United States through Gander, Newfoundland, and on across the Atlantic and the second from the United States through Edmonton to Alaska and the Orient. United States carriers on these routes may pick up and set down traffic at Gander and at Edmonton.

Canada has been granted a through route to Hawaii and on to Australasia and a through route to Florida and on to the Caribbean. On these routes Canadian carriers may pick up and set down traffic at Honolulu and at Tampa-St. Petersburg, Florida.

The chairmen of the two delegations expressed great satisfaction at the conclusion of the negotiations and stated their belief that the new agreement is a fair and reasonable arrangement, which will add to the already excellent record of close and friendly aviation relations between the two countries.

The agreement was signed at Ottawa on June 4 on behalf of the United States by Russell B. Adams, chairman of the United States delegation and member of the Civil Aeronautics Board and on behalf of the Government of Canada by John Baldwin, chairman of the Air Transport Board.

An exchange of notes concerning the use of certain leased bases was also entered into, the notes being signed for the United States by Ambassador Laurence A. Steinhardt and for Canada by A. D. P. Heeney, Under Secretary of State for External Affairs.

June 12, 1949

THE DEPARTMENT

Appointment of Officers

John B. Howard as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State to assist the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Ernest A. Gross, effective May 23, 1949.

Douglas MacArthur as chief of the Division of Western European Affairs, effective May 16, 1949.

PUBLICATIONS

Department of State

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Mexican Agricultural Workers: Legal Employment of Certain Workers Who Entered the State of Texas Illegally. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1858. Pub. 3433. 6 pp. 5¢.

Supplementary Agreement between the United States and Mexico—Effected by exchange of notes signed at Mexico City March 10, 1947; entered into force March 10, 1947.

United States Participation in the United Nations: Report by the President to the Congress for the Year 1948. International Organization and Conference Series III, 29. Pub. 3437. 33 pp. 55¢.

Report by the President to the Congress for the year 1948 on the activities of the United Nations and the participation of the United States therein.

Relief Supplies and Packages for the Netherlands: Duty-Free Entry Payment of Transportation Charges. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1881. Pub. 3452. 7 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and the Netherlands—Effected by the exchange of notes signed at The Hague January 17, 1949; entered into force January 17, 1949.

Passport Visas: Waiver for American Citizens Proceeding to Spitsbergen, Jan Mayen, and Certain Norwegian Dependencies. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1884. Pub. 3458. 1 p. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Norway—Effected by exchange of notes dated at Washington September 10 and October 19, 1948; entered into force October 19, 1949.

Assistance to the People of Italy Under Public Law 389, 80th Congress. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1885. Pub. 3450. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Italy Extending Agreement of January 3, 1948—Effected by exchange of notes verbales dated at Rome December 30, 1948; entered into force December 30, 1948.

Exchange of Official Publications. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1894. Pub. 3472. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Ceylon—Effected by exchange of notes signed at Colombo January 7 and 31, 1949; entered into force January 31, 1949.

Contents

The United Nations and Specialized Agencies

Consultation Between Economic and Social Council and Nongovernmental Organizations. Compiled by Kathleen Bell	739
Summary of Important Decisions of the Second Part of the Third Session of the General Assembly. Texts of Resolutions Adopted by the General Assembly.	745
U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography	749
The United States in the United Nations	750

General Policy

The Atmosphere of Neighborliness Between American States. By Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs.	752
U.S. Notes to Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania Invoke Peace Treaty Clauses To Settle Disputes on Violating Human Freedoms	755
Statement by Acting Secretary Webb	759
Labor Strikes in Bolivian Tin-Mining Areas: Statement by Acting Secretary Webb	764
American Fatalities	764
American Community Activities Continue in Shanghai. Statement by John M. Cabot	765
Siam Officially Changed to Thailand	765
Letters of Credence: Hashemite Jordan Kingdom	765

Treaty Information

U.S. Notes to Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania Invoke Peace Treaty Clauses To Settle Disputes on Violating Human Freedoms.	755
Statement by Acting Secretary Webb	759
Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Transmitted to the Senate	765
Convention With Costa Rica Establishing Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.	766
Air Transport Agreement With Canada Signed	766
Cuba Grants Renegotiations of Certain Tariff Concessions	766

Economic Affairs

Goals and Practical Problems of the Point-4 Program. Address by John R. Steelman	760
--	-----

The Department

Appointment of Officers.	767
----------------------------------	-----

Publications

Department of State.	767
------------------------------	-----

Contributors

The compilation on Consultation Between Ecosoc and Nongovernmental Organizations was prepared by Kathleen Bell, Assistant for International Organizations Affairs in the Division of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Office of United Nations Affairs, Department of State.